

Serial No. 10/736,110
Amdt. dated March 28, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 22, 2005

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action dated March 22, 2005. Entry of this Amendment and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §112

Claim 3 was rejected under §112 for lacking a proper antecedent basis for "said NPN and PNP diversion transistors".

The Examiner correctly notes that claim 3 was meant to depend from claim 2 rather than claim 1. Claim 3 has been amended accordingly. As claim 2 provides an antecedent basis for "said NPN and PNP diversion transistors", the rejection of claim 3 under §112 should be overcome.

All claims but claim 3 were previously found to be allowable, and claim 3 has been amended to overcome its rejection under §112. All of the claims presently in the application are believed to be patentably distinct with respect to the cited art and to otherwise be in proper form for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven C. Patrick
Registration No. 40,341
Attorney for Applicant

March 25, 2005

KOPPEL, JACOBS, PATRICK & HEYBL
555 St. Charles Drive, Suite 107
Thousand Oaks, California 91360
(805) 373-0060